NEW SHAKESPEAREANA.

VOL. X. JANUARY–APRIL, 1910. No. 1.

A TYPE OF FOUR-STRESS VERSE IN SHAKESPEARE.

I.

ON METRICAL READING.

So far as I have read books and articles on versification, these have concerned themselves mainly with the question "How ought such-and-such lines to be read" rather than asking how the lines *are* read or how they might be read. I take it that this reveals the cause for much of the confusion existing with regard to metrics. Lines ought to be read so-and-so, but they are not. Often the metrist would not read lines which come under his own law as he himself has pronounced that they should be read. There is nothing left for the student therefore, but to scan after arbitrary laws and to read haphazard.

Fortunately, authorities are pretty well agreed that a line is metrical if divided by the ear into a certain number of equal time parts. A pentameter line, for example, is divided into five equal time parts. But if we accept this definition for the present, are we able to tell how a line has been divided by a given reader? We know that he ought to have read the line in a certain fashion, but did he? Many would be unwilling to answer such a question, preferring to reason as follows: A pentameter line is divided into five equal time parts. At this place, Shakespeare, as everyone knows, was writing pentameter. Therefore the reader has divided the line into five equal time parts. But suppose the reader says "I divided it into four." Moreover, suppose that he *did*.

As far as the reading itself is concerned,

"Who shall arbitrate?
Ten men love what I hate,
Shun what I follow, slight what I receive,
Ten, who in ears and eyes
Match me."

Some persons of my acquaintance prefer to read verse as if it were prose. Some prefer a strict metrical reading. Some like to emphasize the stressed syllables. Others read with very little stress. Still others disregard the existence of run-on lines and read each line as if it were end-stopped.

Now I can see no objection to a man's reading lines end-stopped, particularly if he wrote them, nor any objection to his emphasizing stressed syllables at pleasure, provided he knows what a run-on line is, and can read metrically without stress. In fact, I see no objection to a man's reading any line of poetry as he pleases, provided he knows what he is doing. Why then study metrics? Why, to learn what one is doing. Whether a man chooses to read metrically or not, he ought to be able to read metrically, as an opera singer in recitative ought to know the strict time of a passage before he departs from it; or as a composer must be able to satisfy the rule about consecutive fifths before he breaks it. It matters a great deal who takes the liberty and why.

In training the ear to appreciate metrical reading, one might begin by giving the stressed syllables strong emphasis, but, as soon as the division into time parts is plain, he might reduce the emphasis to a minimum, and read more smoothly though none the less metrically. Although simple this exercise is by no means easy.

Another exercise to the same end would be the following:

Take a normal pentameter line and read it, deliberately, in some eccentric fashion. Take, say, the line:

And all the clouds that lour'd upon our house

Read it first:

And all the clouds that lour'd upon our house

1 | 2 1 | 2 1 | 2 1 | 2 1 | 2*

*In this notation, the numerals stand for multiples of a time unit, e. g., in musical notation, 1 would become a quarter note, 2 a half note, 1½ a dotted quarter, ½ an eighth note, and so on.

Then (one number to a syllable):

And all the clouds that lour'd upon our house

1 | 1 1 | 1 1 | 1 1| 1 1 | 1

2 | 1 2 | 1 2 | 1 2| 1 2 | 1

2 | 2 1 | 1 2 | 2 1| 1 2 | 1

Finally:

1 | 2 1 | 3 | 1 1 1| 2 1 | 2

1 | 2 1 | 2 1 | ½ ½ 1 1 | 2

1 | 2 1 | ½ 1½ ½ ½| 2 1 | 2

The last reading (tetrameter):

And|áll the|clóuds that lour'd up|ón our|house

is, of course, very bad. It is just about as bad as if we should read the next line in Richard III:

In|thé deep|bósom|óf the|ócean|buried

1 | 2 1 | 2 1 | 2 1 | 2 1 | 1 1

But, if we reverse the scansion:

And|áll the|clóuds that|lour'd up|ón our|house
In the|déep|bósom of the|ócean|buried

we have a reading which is natural for at least a dozen people who have read this couplet in my hearing. Probably no one would read the first of these lines in the above tetrameter, and I have never heard the second line read in any way but tetrameter.

Consider the following couplet, scanned:

But|I have|thát with|in which|pásseth|shów
|Thése but the|tráppings and the|suits of|wóe

and all passes off naturally; but scan the lines:

But|I have|thát within which|pásseth|shów
These|bút the|tráppings|ánd the|suits of|woe

and something is decidedly wrong.

There is, in the blank verse of Shakespeare, Milton, and others, a ten-syllable tetrameter line, of which the lines quoted above:

In the deep bosom of the ocean buried

and

These but the trappings and the suits of woe

are examples. Other examples are:

|Now is the|winter of our|discon|tent
Made|glorious|summer by this|sun of|York
Our|dreadful|marches to de|lightful|measures
He|capers|nimbly in a|lady's|chamber,

chosen from the first page of Richard III.

But suppose some one differs with me as to the reading of these lines. Why, he may read them exactly as he pleases. My contention is not that the lines *ought* to be read tetrameter ("on what compulsion must I, tell me that") but that, in general, they are read tetrameter and are called pentameter. But, some one may say, the tetrameters cannot be distinguished readily. That is only saying that the pentameters cannot be distinguished readily, which is the real crux of the situation.

An exercise in metrics more difficult than those already mentioned would be for a student to pick out, in his own reading, such lines of blank verse as he divides into four equal parts and which are therefore tetrameter according to his reading. Then let him listen to the reading of some one else. Finally let him hear a play of Shakespeare's, given by actors who pay some attention to metre. Let him listen to the way in which the Ben Greet Players, for example, deliver their lines, rather than deciding in advance how they ought to deliver them.

The question of obligation, in reading poetry, may well be deferred until the earnest student has faced the question "Do I know how I have divided this line?" There is room here for considerable searching of heart. If a person is content to read poetry haphazard with a blind confidence that the poet was writing pentameter, there is no objection

to his doing so unless he calls himself a student of versification. For the eye would be of very little service in measurement if it could not tell the difference between four space divisions and five. Even so, the ear is hardly trustworthy if it cannot tell four time divisions from five, provided such divisions are made.

For the purposes of this paper, a line is in no particular metre until it has been read. The question "what metre" is to be decided then by the ear, and is virtually the question "Into how many equal time parts has the line been divided by the reader." If we do not distinguish metrically between lines divided into four equal parts and five equal parts our study is confused at the very outset. A similar confusion would arise if, now and then, we should substitute four, meaning five, in our multiplication table.

II.

ON METRICAL THEORY.

In trying to pick out Shakespeare's ten syllable tetrameters the writer spent a year in practice with little or no satisfaction for want of a theory of meter which would work for these difficult lines. As soon as such a theory was found the task became comparatively simple and the reading pleasant enough, though I doubt if life would be worth living during any arbitrary scansion of so many lines.

We have here a problem in applied mathematics. It is this: Find a set of definitions for the terms in question which will be self-consistent and which will apply to the reading of poetry. It is easy to build up a set of definitions which will fulfil the first requirement. For example, consider the following set: "A pentameter line is a line of ten syllables such that the first syllable is short, the second long, the third short, and so on. A syllable is long when its vowel is followed by two consonants, otherwise it is short." There is nothing inconsistent here but the set is of no value to poets and readers, for the line would leave only occasional existence in English verse. In fact, it would be an accident if we ever found such a line.

Having stated the problem, let us attempt its solution by means of the following set of definitions, keeping in mind that a line must be read before we consider it, and that metrical problems are to be decided by the ear. *A line*is* metrical *if it is divided by the ear into a certain number of*

---

*"Line" is not defined in this paper.

equal time parts called feet. A pentameter line contains five equal time parts, and so on. *The syllables which mark points of divisions are called* stressed.

It is of primary importance to notice that we need just enough emphasis on the stressed syllables to show that the line has been divided into equal time parts. I say emphasis because that is the way time division is usually marked in English verse. It need not be emphasis any more than the points of division in a straight line A B need be marked in ink. Emphasis secures time division and time division requires emphasis—or something "just as good." In mathematical parlance, emphasis at equal intervals of time is sufficient, but not necessary for stress.

If some syllable other than a stressed syllable is emphasized, it does not affect the meter in general. For example, in the line:

And|all the|clouds that|lour'd up|on our|house

one may emphasize the word *our* as much as he likes, without disturbing the metrical scheme. If word accent and stress fall together, so much the better. If word accent and stress are too much at variance the line is bad. For example, try to make a pentameter line out of the first ten syllables of the preceding sentence,*

"If word accent and stress are too much at".

Evidently, then, the fact that there are often ten syllables in a pentameter, is trivial. It is trivial that there are sometimes five "strong stresses" for both Gummere and Abbott** find that about two in three of the pentameter lines which they investigate have four strong stresses. What, then, is essential to a pentameter line? It must be divided into five equal time parts; or let us rather say, into five parts approximately equal, for the

---

*The condition "ten syllables" is neither necessary nor sufficient for a pentameter line, since pentameters frequently have eleven syllables or nine. A condition *sufficient* for a conclusion means "if the condition, then the conclusion"; a condition *necessary* for a conclusion means "if the conclusion, then the condition".

**F. B. Gummere, On the Translation of Beowulf, Am. Jour. Philol., VII, 1896, p. 57 ff.

E. A. Abbott, A Shakespearian Grammar, p. 330.

monotony which arises when a passage is written too strictly is well known. To find this at its worst read H VI2, Act 5, Sc. 1, 1-11, for example, the lines:

> Let them obey who know not how to rule.
> This hand was made to handle naught but gold,
> I cannot give due action to my words,
> Except a sword or sceptre balance it.
> A sceptre shall it have, have I a soul,
> On which I'll toss the flower-de-luce of France.

Then we have Pistol's mock heroics addressed to his prisoner at Agincourt wherein Shakespeare seems to satirize this very style; putting these pentameters into the mouth of the low-born Pistol:

> "O, Signieur Dew should be a gentleman!
> Perpend my words, O Signieur Dew, and mark;
> O Signieur Dew, thou diest on point of fox;
> Except, O Signieur, thou do give to me
> Egregious ransom." H. V. 4, 4, 7.

In good verse, on the contrary, a natural reading departs from the scansion by "slight changes" as a pianist may depart slightly from the metronome and yet play his piece in a certain tempo. Chopin used to say that his left hand kept time for his right. Liszt's famous description of the tempo rubato amounts to saying, "You see the tree, yonder. The leaves quiver. The trunk stands firm."

These slight changes make for "the life of the verse" (Genung). In fact, it is much more fatiguing to scan Henry VI than Tempest, or Winter's Tale, or Coriolanus. It is more difficult to scan these last but it is far more interesting. As examples of good pentameter consider the following lines and contrast them with the H. VI passage:

> And|all the|clouds that|lour'd up|on our|house.
> |Now are our|brows|bound with vic|torious|wreaths.
> |Caius|Marcius|Corio|lanus!|Bear
> |Even as she|speaks,|why, their|hearts were|yours.
> And|throw't a|gainst the|wind. To the|market|place!
> He|comes up|on a|wish.|Fortune is|merry.
> You|taught me|language|and my|profit|on't
> |Is, I know|how to|curse.

|High e|vents as|these
Strike|those that|make them;|and their|story|is
No|less in|pity|than his|glory|which
|Brought them to|be la|mented.
.....|constant you|are
But|yet a|woman;|and for|secre|cy
No|lady|closer.
I|pray thee|mark me—|that a|brother|should
Be|so per|fidious—

But what is the meaning of the word "slight" above? And where are we to stop if we depart from the scansion at all? Instead of this question let us ask the following: Given a line of ten syllables how are we to determine its meter? And why is not prose in some meter or other? To answer these questions we must extend our definition of pentameter and say *the ten syllables under discussion make up a pentameter line if the reading departs from a pentameter scansion by slight changes.* If not the reading may destroy all meter. Then the line is prose.* If a passage impresses the ear as being divided into lines of nearly equal length and feet of nearly equal length it is bad prose. Consider for example, the question asked above:

"And why is not prose in some meter or other."

If the line is not pentameter and not prose, there is one other possibility. The reading may set up a new meter. We are now in a position to define the phrase "slight changes." *Changes from a pentameter scansion to a natural reading are "slight" if they do not result in destroying all meter or in setting up a new meter;* in other words, a line is pentameter if a natural reading is nearer to a pentameter scansion than to a tetrameter or a hexameter, or a no-meter line, where "natural" means "natural for the reader."

If we resort to formulas* to sum up the preceding, we may say that for an n-meter line.

$$(1) \quad t=nc$$

---

*Prose differs from verse in presenting *no* metrical form from which we may pass to a reading by slight changes.

*The parts of this paper where mathematical symbols are used may be omitted, if the reader wishes, since they serve only as a translation of what has gone before.

where t represents the time of the line, n the number of feet and c the time of each foot.

For a pentameter line

$$(2) \quad t=5c$$

and so on. If (2) is not strictly accurate, we may say at least that if a line is pentameter, the time, t, impresses the ear as 5 c rather than 4 c′, or 6 c″, or $c_1+c_2+\ldots\ldots+c^n$ (where the c's are connected by no metrical law) and that the converse is true; then we have stated a condition both necessary and sufficient for pentameter.

III.

THE TEN SYLLABLE TETRAMETER.

Professor Gummere (loc. cit.) describes the line*

(a) No secret island *in* the boundless main

by saying that it has four "strong stresses", a "heaping up of light syllables" in the middle of the line, and a "weak stress" (in italics); but he does not distinguish (and, indeed, it is not necessary for his purpose) between this line and lines such as:

Here falling houses thunder *on* your heads
While *yet* my steady steps no staff sustains.
Where honest*y* and sense are no disgrace.

for these also have four strong stresses, a heaping up of light syllables and a weak stress (if the phrase be not a contradiction) which may occur in any one of the five feet.

Now all these lines, save (a), I should call pentameter since the reading departs from the scansion by changes which are only slight. The lines divide into five parts rather than four, and this is to be expected, for, otherwise, following the figures given by Gummere and Abbott, sixty per cent. of Johnson's London and two-thirds of Shakespeare would be tetrameter.

Let us examine the "strong stress—light syllable" theory for a moment.

---

*Johnson's London.

As I understand this theory, the normal pentameter line contains five strong stresses. Since most pentameter lines contain only four, we must select a fifth. But how? If we choose the fifth stress by its *position* relative to the other stresses we are in hopeless difficulty for we are making number of syllables an essential in meter. As a matter of fact, the fifth stress comes in when it is *time* for it; that is, we locate a fifth stress so that this stress, with the other four, shall divide the line into five equal time parts.

And as regards the light syllable, what is it? Undoubtedly we can pick out certain syllables which are very light and certain others which are strongly stressed, but where shall we draw the line? The gradation from strong stress to light syllable is so subtle that I doubt if any one could pick out light syllables, with a feeling of certainty, in any other than an arbitrary manner. For no syllable is light of itself and once for all. Consider the lines:

And|on the|winking|of au|thori-ty. K. J. 4, 2, 211.
To|seek a|living|in our|terri|tory. A. Y. L. I. 3, 1, 8.
And|hang a|calf's skin|on his|recreant|limbs. K. J. 3, 1, 199.
To|hold o|pinion|with Py|thago|ras. M. of V. 4, 1, 128.
|Corio|lanus| in Co|rio|li. Cor. 5. 6, 90.
But|lend it|rather|to thine|ene|my. M. of V. 1, 3, 136.
They|have their|exits|and their|entran|ces. A. Y. L. I. 2, 7, 141.
|He is a|good one,|and his|worthi|ness. O. 2, 1, 212.

Here the light stress in the middle of the line is so far from light that I consider the lines pentameter rather than tetrameter.

The strong stress and light syllable, then, fail to define type (a). Lanier, with his musical notation, fails to define the type simply because he departs from his own principles where this line is concerned, taking for granted that it is pentameter. For he says,* "(1) that in Shakespeare's verse the only way to get the exact rhythm is to read for the sense; (2) that Shakespeare never mangles the type of his blank verse; (3) that consequently, in every line five rhythmic accents are always present or accounted for." As far as type (a) is concerned, (1) and (3) are contradictory, whether or not there be any "mangling" of the verse.

Lanier gives the following scansion:*

---

*Science of English Verse, p. 214.

*Loc. cit., p. 173. Lanier's notation is musical and the accent comes on the second beat in his measures.

|The slings|and ár|rows óf|outrá|geous fórtune.|

| 1 2 | 1 2| 1 2| 1 2| 1 1½ ½|

|A thing|of beau|ty is|a jóy|forever.|

| 1 2 | 1 2 | 1 2|1 2 | 1 1 1|

Now, if any one prefers to read (a) lines after this fashion I have no quarrel with him, but (so far as I have noticed) no one reads them so. Then either we must have one rule for reading and one for scansion, or else we must scan these lines tetrameter.

If it is not already established that (1), *the ten syllable tetrameter is a special norm in heroic verse,* we may add that this norm is readily recognized in a prose passage. For example, in K. L. 1, 2, 66 ff., we have five of these lines occurring in a prose passage of seventy lines. Gloucester says, *"You know the character to be your brother's"* and *"These late eclipses in the sun and moon* portend no good to us" while, after his father's exit, Edmund says, (line 129) " . . . when we are sick in fortune, *often the surfeit of our own behavior,* we make guilty of our disasters the sun, the moon, and the stars *as if we were villains by necessity, fools by heavenly compulsion",* and so on.

We shall exclude from heroic verse lines of the doggerel type:

He reputes me a cannon, and the bullet, that's he
I shoot thee at the swain. Thump then and I flee.

or

I, Costard, running out that was safely within
Fell over the threshold and broke my shin.

Lines (rare) such as the following:

You do look, my son, in a moved sort. T. 4, 1, 146.
And sith there's no justice in earth nor hell. T. A. 4, 3, 50.
Thank me no thankings, nor proud me no prouds. R. & J. 3, 5, 153.
When steel grows soft as the parasite's silk. Cor. 1, 9, 45.

seem to be four feet of a pentameter line if we connect them with pentameter at all.

Lines (rare)* where the caesura seems to take the place of a foot or part of a foot, we shall consider pentameter, for example:

Shall|lose me|.|what! in a|town of|war. O. 2, 3.
With|this thin|helm|. Mine|enemy's|dog. K. L. 4, 7.
As thou|art in de|sire|?|Wouldst thou have|that. Mac. 1, 7.

Here there is a *discontinuity* in the verse, a silence for a foot or an appreciable part of a foot which is needed to complete the line. But, (II), *the (a) line, read continuously, does not seem incomplete and does not offend the ear in the midst of a pentameter passage.* Shakespeare uses it in couplets as follows, first 4 and 4:

A|father|cruel and a|stepdame|false;
A|foolish|suitor to a|wedded|lady. Cym. 1, 6, 1.

then 4 followed by 5:

A|credulous|father and a|brother|noble.
Whose|nature|is so|far from|doing|harms. K. L. 1, 2, 195.

lastly, 5 and 4:

|I am the|son of|Marcus|Cato,|ho!
A|foe to|tyrants and my|country's|friend.

Futhermore in Buckingham's speech (R. III, 3, 7, 117-140) the first two lines in pentameter are followed by six in ten syllable tetrameter and there are thirteen tetrameter lines out of twenty-four in the speech.

Now how is it possible for this tetrameter to do the work of a perfect pentameter line when other tetrameters are excluded? An occasional line of doggerel would not please the ear. For example, imagine:

"The fox, the ape and the humble bee
Were still at odds, being but three."

In the midst of a pentameter passage. I do not know why the (a) line pleases the ear when used with pentameter lines and, for this discussion, it might suffice simply to note the fact. However, we may say (III) *the time length of the (a) line is equal to the time length of the pentameter.*

---

*"Not uncommon," Abbott, loc. cit. p. 413.

The pentameter line may be measured if we measure four of the five feet and multiply the result by five-fourths. Now it is an easy matter to measure four feet of a pentameter line by snapping a stop watch at the first and the last stress, and this is quite within the realm of experiment as it takes about two seconds to read a pentameter line while the stop watch reading is correct to one-fifth of a second. Similarly an (a) line may be timed if we multiply by four-thirds the time from the first to the last stress.

Not trusting himself as an observer in this matter, the writer secured the services of five persons who were kind enough to read 276 lines, some type (a), some pentameter. No one of the five had been trained to tell the difference between the two types of line and three did not know the purpose of the experiment. However, no one of them recorded a difference as great as one-tenth of a second between the average (a) and the average pentameter.

From the existence of the ten syllable tetrameter, we have the equation:

$$t'=4c'.$$

From the existence of the pentameter line, we have already found:

$$t=5c$$

From the proposition just proved we have t=t', so that, for heroic verse:

$$t=5c=4c'.$$

Where c is the time of a pentameter foot and c' the time ot a tetrameter foot, t, therefore, is a suitable unit of measure for heroic verse although c is not.

It is to be kept in mind that if any one prefers to read heroic verse *as pentameter throughout,* the tetrameter form which we have noticed does not exist for him. The run-on line would not exist for one who preferred to read all his verses end-stopped. The value of the verse test supplied by the run-on line lies in the assumption that readers do not differ much in their selection of run-on lines. Similarly let us make the assumption (and it holds true so far as I have noticed) that readers do not differ much in their selection of ten syllable tetrameters. At first, however, it is likely that the more carefully any one reads a ten syllable line tetrameter, the more stoutly he will maintain that he has read it pentameter. The fact

that the line is metrical and in a pentameter passage seems to force the conclusion that it is a pentameter line.

The results obtained after over two years' practice in scanning Shakespeare's plays show that, (IV), *the (a) line supplies a verse test for chronology in Shakespeare, appearing oftener in the earlier plays.* In the table which follows are given the results from the third complete scansion of the thirty-three plays mentioned, wherein, to secure a reasonable degree of fairness and protect the investigation from the theorem in question, no two acts of the same play were scanned in succession and no results were taken until the reading of all the plays was completed.

TABLE.

Play.	Approx. Date.	Per Cent. (a).	Play.	Approx. Date.	Per Cent. (a).
*L. L. L.....	'89	12.1	M. Ado.	'99	12.
T. A.	'84-'89	13.4	T. N.	'00	10.9
C. of E.	'89-'91	15.2	Ham.	'00	10.4
H. VI2	'91-'92	14.8	J. C.	'00	10.2
H. VI3	'91-'92	13.8	All's W.	'01	10.1
T. G. V.....	'93	14.2	Tr. & Cr.....	'99-'05	10.6
R. III	'93	16.	M. for M....	'03	9.7
R. II	'93	14.2	O.	'04	9.5
M. N. D.....	'94	13.2	K. L.	'05	7.1
R. & J.....	'94	11.4	Mac.	'06	8.6
K. J.	'95	14.2	A. & C.....	'08	7.7
H. IV1	'96	14.6	Cor.	'09	6.2
M. of V.....	'96	11.9	W. T.	'10	7.4
H. IV2	'98	14.5	Cym.	'10	6.9
H. V.	'99	12.9	***H. VIII	'11	7.3
A. Y. L. I.....	'99	10.8	T.	'12	6.1
**M. W. W.....	'99	6.4			

The first thing that strikes one, on examining the above table, is that

*Corrected in '97.

**266 verses.

***Act. I, 1, 2, Act II, 3, Act III, 2 to King's exit, Act V, 1.

L. L. L. is decidedly out of place. But not if we consider that the original text of '89 is lost and that the play was rewritten in '97. Then M. W. W. has too small a percentage of (a) lines. But this is not remarkable for the 266 verses of this play, for R III, 3, 7 (240 lines) has 25 per cent (a) lines while the two scenes following (226 lines) have only 12 per cent. In W. T. 1, 2, 1-240, there are only five (a) lines or 2 per cent., while in the same play, 2, 3, (207 lines) we find 10 per cent., and in 3, 2 (228 lines) 14 per cent., that is, the test is not valid for 250 lines.

The foregoing figures will serve the reader if he cares to compare his choice of (a) lines with the writer's. A simple test of (IV) would be to notice that in the first pages of C. of E. there are many (a) lines and in the first pages of W. T. very few of these lines.

If we detach the early comedies from the historical plays, we have the sequence: L. L. L. 12.1, C. of E. 15.2, T. G. V. 14.2, M. N. D. 13.2, M. of V. 11.9, A. Y. L. I. 10.8, and so on, where the plays are given in supposed chronological order. For the same period, however, we find, considering only the historical plays: H. VI_2, 14.8, H. VI_3 13.8, R III 16, R II 14.2, K. J. 14.2, H. IV_1 14.6, H. IV_2 14.5, H. V. 12.9; that is, in the historical plans from '89 to '99 there is very little difference as far as (a) is concerned.

Now why should the (a) line occur oftener in the earlier Shakespearean plays? I take it, (V), *type (a) served as a formal relief from monotony at a time when Shakespeare's style was most rigid.** Later it appears less frequently, because as the poet became master of his style we find his verse much freer. There was less need of any special means of relief and a greater tendency to depart from any fixed form. With more and more variety in the slight changes from perfect pentameter scansion, Shakespeare is able to avoid dreariness in his verse without passing to another meter, that is, his later plays show a greater art in normal variation and at the same time are truer to the pentameter type.

Charles W. Cobb.

Amherst, Massachusetts.

**Mutatis mutandis*, we might find (a) lines occurring oftener in the later work of some other poet.

WILLIAM SHAKESPEARE A CATHOLIC—THE FINAL WORD.

PHILADELPHIA, January 3, 1909.

MY DEAR DR. MORGAN:

On page 84, of Volume I, of NEW SHAKESPEAREANA, as well as often elsewhere, you have stated that Shakespeare was a CATHOLIC. I am sure every one of an hundred passages in the Plays show that he was not a Puritan. But as to his not being a Protestant, I have my doubts, in spite of your able demonstration.

Would it have been possible for a Catholic to have uttered that defiance of the Papal power in King John, "No Romish Priest shall tithe and toll in our dominions?" I will not cite all the other passages, with which you are more familiar than I am. Any Shakespeare concordance supplies them by the score. I am willing to believe that Shakespeare was not a hide-bound Protestant: was, in fact, charitable to all Religions; but that he was a Roman Catholic I cannot believe!

I am aware that I am assuming considerable temerity to disagree with so old and extreme an authority as yourself on a Shakespeare matter. But I must say I cannot agree with you just here.

Believe me Dear Dr. Morgan, with high regard.

HENRY G. LANGFORD.

NEW YORK CITY, January 29, 1911.

MY DEAR MR. LANGFORD:

I am mortified to find that I have permitted this letter to remain unanswered for fully two years, though I am sure that its receipt was acknowledged at the time. Let us now try if we cannot, you and I once for all, get at this matter and foreclose it so that it may worry us no more!

On page 175 of The Shakespearean Myth, written in 1877, I said: "The then very recent dissolution of the Monasteries had thrown multitudes of learned clerks upon their own resources for daily bread, and there was only one depot for their work. There were no newspapers, journals or magazines. But there was the Theatre which demanded literary effort and presumably paid for it."

"Again, in 1888, in "Shakespeare In Fact and In Criticism", I recurred to the matter because the very self-evident proposition (as it seemed to me) that Shakespeare was a Catholic—quantitively important, if we asked where his material came from—was thrown back at me by the statement

that England was Protestant at Shakespeare's date. To this I answered (page 226)—that, whatever rumour of the policy of Elizabeth may have reached Warwickshire none of its effect was visible in the religious exercises of the masses for almost a century. Until, at least, Shakespeare had been long dead and buried.

In Shakespeare's childhood, and during a period covering his entire Stratford and London life, a clergyman was still a Priest, and was still regarded with pious veneration in the rural districts as a semi-supernatural being. The altar still stood in its place, the minister appeared in surplice, and the prayers of the old Catholic liturgy were still intoned. The old familiar bells, Catholic as they were, still called the congregations together with their musical peal, Catholic as were all the emotions they suggested, though in the midst of triumphant, political Protestantism. The old differences between Roman and Anglican were for once completely at rest. The transfer of the throne from Mary to Elizabeth had operated as a transfer to the Supremacy of the Church. But, while here and there a politician or a scholar may have looked askance, at the result, the people certainly knew no difference. Out of nine thousand four hundred of the parochial clergy, less than two hundred hesitated to acquiesce in the change.

The strictest Roman Catholic families recognized the rite of baptism as administered by the Established Church. They could not do otherwise, in fact, as there was no other to recognize. Nearly a century was to elapse before Protestant baptism was declared invalid by Rome. The same church edifices were there, the same clergy read the same services, administered the same sacraments, the priests were not only the people's spiritual but their temporal advisers, the regulators of their social intercourse, their business, their festivities and their sports. Most important of all, these Priests were the schoolmasters of the children, and, whatever learning there was, or whatever was called learning—was possessed and taught by them.

What recusants there were were so scretly; they had no organization, no machinery, and if they held services it was in darkened rooms and with barred doors. As we shall see, John Shakespeare was one of these, but even if an open secret with his friends, it was a secret still!

So generally peaceful was the gliding from Rome to Protestantism that DeQuadra (the Envoy of Spain, near the English throne) wrote to the Spanish Minister at Rome in 1562, "begging him to ask the Pope in the name of English Catholics, to decree that they might without sin, be present at the Common Prayers. The case was a new and not at all an easy

one. For the Protestant Prayer Book contained neither impiety nor false doctrine. The prayers themselves were those of the Catholic Church, altered only so far as to omit the merits and the intercession of the Saints. So that except for the concealment, and the injury, which might arise from the example, there was nothing in the compliance itself positively unlawful." (Froude. History of England, VII, 472.)

I most distinctly remember writing that passage in "The Myth", because it had suddenly flashed upon me, in the midst of my attempts to reconcile facts in the biographies with certain things in the Plays, and with traditions, that everything was reconciled, with everything and, relatively explained, by supposing William Shakespeare, like his father and his father's fathers, to have been of the Old Faith!

This discovery, or acknowledgment, that the Dramatist was a Catholic—a true son of the Old Faith, however, had been announced, none too cheerfully, in that remarkable jumble of monody, soliloquy, spasm and incoherence, which Carlyle calls a "History of The French Revolution. "But as I had never (as I suppose I should have done) acquired a taste for Carlyle, who, whatever he wrote, was always subjectively upon the stage himself. I had never happened upon it! That statement, or (as it was in his mouth) —Confession—is in Chapter II of Book First, of "The French Revolution" (in which, however, the words "France" or "French" are hard to find). Here it is:

"Nay thus too—if Catholicism with and against Feudalism (but not against Nature and her bounty) gave us English, a Shakespeare, and Era of Shakespeare; and so produced a blossom of Catholicism—it was not until Catholicism itself, so far as Law could abolish it, had been abolished here!"

It is not always easy to imagine what Carlyle meant in his interjected matter. As he was supposed to be writing about things in France (though the name of France is hard to find in the opening chapters of his "French Revolution") the "here" is ambiguous. But the term, "us English", sufficiently confesses that it was the English Shakespeare which Catholicism produced.

Here, then, I might have found it! But I shall never forget the moment when it came upon me, with the impact of conviction, that every inconsistency of the biographies, and all the problems of circumstantial evidence, were explained, satisfied and at rest, by just knowing that the English Dramatist, like Cervantes and Dante (the greatest triumverate of life, and letters the word has ever known or ever can know) was a son of the Catholic Church!

No longer is it a difficulty where Shakespeare derived that absolute command of his own Past—that fulness in minute and current matters of past cycles—immaterialities that had earned only the slightest entry of record in records that had themselves perished, but of which, in his alembic, he could make just one opposition, and then himself forget! As in the list of his Hapax Legomena, he used once and then forever discarded a larger number of words than John Milton, possessed in his entire vocabulary, so in the materials of his plays, he absolutely foreclosed the material he worked in! Where did he get it? Where, indeed, but from the storehouses, where alone was preserved the lore and the literature that otherwise would have been utterly lost to mankind—perished from the face of the planet—from the Religious Establishments, the monasteries and the convents, in which alone Letters and Learning had been cherished and its muniments preserved, during the Dark Ages, by the Catholic Church.

When, under Henry the Eighth, these Religious Establishments were despoiled, stripped and razed, by his royal Escheaters (a title even then, for obvious reasons, abbreviated to "Cheaters") where could the dispersed scholars have recourse for food and shelter—but to good Catholics, like Shakespeare? And Shakespeare could not only have given them food and shelter, but employment too!

How simple the whole explanation is? No need of any Baconian Theory now!

Perhaps I may note here just a few of the instances in the investigations, where the fact that William Shakespeare was a son of the Old Faith at once clears the air and explains an item or a circumstance where we had been blindly guessing or conjuring up possibilities, or meandering away afield after all sorts of whimsical and bizarre theories to account for them ever since Shakespeare was studied at all! King Henry had divorced himself from his pious and stately consort Catherine, not by axe and bolck (as he began to do later, as his "conscience" required) but through form of what he called "the law"! The comment of the kingdom was not awry, however, as Shakespeare himself records in one deft Shakespearean touch—

Chamberlin. It seems the marriage with his brother's wife
Has crept too near his conscience!
Suffolk. No, his conscience
Hath crept too near another lady!

Henry the Eighth is the only one of the Historical Plays which was not published during Shakespeare's lifetime. Why?

A careless, even the most perfunctory reading of that play, shows us that the gravamen of the whole play is to ennoble and eulogize the character of Queen Catherine. But Queen Elizabeth was the daughter of Queen Catherine's rival and supplanter, Anne Bullen. To be sure, Shakespeare did not handle Queen Elizabeth's mother very roughly. He was too full of the milk of human kindness to deal very harshly with anybody. (Not Macbeth, or Richard, or even Iago will Shakespeare dismiss without the best he can say of him. Even to Iago, he gives a last touch of sympathy, and he always lets his villains go unpunished somehow!) And so in this play, Anne is merely flippant. She lets Lord Sands kiss her. But kissing was the usual salutation between titled persons. (Desdemona, according to the first folio, gave Othello for his pains, "a world of kisses," instead of "a world of sighs," as modern editions have it. And when Romeo at Capulet's masked ball offers to kiss poor little Juliet, on a first meeting, she does not demur, although, in pretty allusion to Romeo's monk's robe and cowl, she says: "Hand to hand is holy palmer's kiss). And I cannot see why Anne, who has already begun to see the king's drift, should not have näively protested that she would not for all the wealth in the world be a Queen, or why she should not have said to the old waiting-lady:

Anne. "Pray do not deliver what here you've heard to her [Queen Catherine]

Old Lady. What do you think of me?"

These are straws only, and very negligible straws too!

But however lightly poor Anne Bullen is drawn, it is plain that the Play was lèse Mageste in Queen Elizabeth's thinking. Her policy was in nothing more strenuous than to wean the public thought from her own bastardy by the Common as well as the Ecclesiastic Law! Indeed, even in the rush of her own coronation she did not forget it, and actually her first royal decree was to the effect that no Play, Broadside, or publication of any sort "in which matters of State or of religion should be handled or treated," should be permitted throughout the realm. So, of course, this Play could neither be presented on a stage nor printed in Broadside (what we now call the "Quartos"), during Elizabeth's reign, and so we note aliunde that Shakespeare uttered no word of eulogy or lament, or even expressed the least regret at Elizabeth's demise. The theory, so congenial to most of my colleagues that the passages in The Midsummer Nights dream beginning "I saw a mermaid on a dolphin's back, etc," is eulogy of Elizabeth, may

be correct. But it is only Theory. And even if correct, it was only a sop to the lord of Kenilworth.

But, as we now have it, the Play is a dramatic solecism—a perfect Janus-Bifrons among Plays! The first four acts are an exaultation of Queen Catherine—of her noble bearing, her courtly courtesy even to her enemies, who are seeking to depose and divorce her. It is in every line testimony to the affection of the English people for her saintly character and her charities. Nay, it is even testimony to the admiration and respect for her, cherished by the bloated king himself! No effort to beautify her is wanting. She is depicted as forgiving Cardinal Woolsey, in that he had aught to reluctantly do with her fate. For Cardinal Woolsey, who would "have no Bullens"—is given the sympathy of the spectators and grandly eulogized, every honour paid him in his fall and every dignity in him satisfied, in those first four acts! More lèsé magesté from the Elizabethan point of view!

But, mirabile dictu! In the fifth act, as printed in 1623, all this is changed! Anne Bullen's child is now the subject of eulogy. The child of the illegal (from every English standpoint) consort, who has taken the Queenly Catherine's place! We have the public rejoicing at the Christening ceremonies, the pageants, the cheering crowds and, to crown all the inconsistency, a glowing description of the "glories" of Queen Elizabeth's reign. (A reign by the way, not yet a fait accomplis. From any standpoint, not until the end of it could it have been know to have been "glorious"! We might be reminded, indeed, of that genius who wrote a novel placing his scene in the year A. D., 800, and who makes one of his characters say: "'We men of the Middle Ages')." But, knowing that Shakespeare was of the Old Faith—of a party that cherished the memory of Catholic Queen Catherine and looked upon Elizabeth as a usurper, as was her mother, how clearly this difficulty is accounted for?

In order to make the play of Henry the Eighth publishable—Shakespeare's own fifth act is removed and an entirely new one—eulogizing Elizabeth—is substituted. The lèse magesté is removed, and the play is taken from beneath the ban of the Stage Censor.

Shakespeare's fifth act (the existence of which we predicate upon the custom which he always follows of writing his plays in the canonical five act scheme) was, of course, uniform in trend with the other four. This sufficiently appears from the Prologue:

> "I come no more to make you laugh, things now
> That wewr a weighty and a serious brow," etc.

That Prologue would never have served to usher in such a pean upon Elizabeth's birth as the present Fifth Act is, as it stands to-day.

That our external evidence agrees for once with the unanimous concurrence of every Dramatic and Textual Critic, is surely a gratification! But every Dramatic Critic at whatever consequence, admits that the present Fifth Act of the Henry the Eighth is a dramatic anti-climax! And that its style and phrasing is not that of the author of the first four act; every textual critic admits. Such a concordance, I think, justifies us in the assertion that the Stage Censor went to work at the play with his hatchet, and that, when he had finished his work, the play was effectually purged of its Elizabethan lèse magesté, by the Lopé de Vega method of sacrificing consistency to practical purposes!

But now it urges that Shakespeare, being the alter-ego of Lord Southampton, could write as he pleased. I doubt if this can be very seriously urged. Not Southampton himself, any more than Essex or Raleigh, were permitted to relax themselves in homage to Elizabeth's whims. The first use that the Tudors made of their great men was to cut the great men's heads off. And Elizabeth was every inch a Tudor. I don't myself believe in that Southampton story as I have so often set forth. There is no trace of it in the Southampton family records or anywhere else. Unless a couple of dedications are evidence—in a day when publishers dedicated anything to anybody for commercial purposes (we have George Wither's exact testimony as to that publisher's custom).

But brushing my own theories aside, now comes Dr. Wallace, with records proving that William Shakespeare actually lodged in Mugwell Street with a refugee Frenchman, who made wigs for a living in an obscure street, and eked out his livelihood by taking lodgers. Those who can conceive of Southampton in his palaces and Shakespeare in his lodgings at the wig-maker's as Damon and Pythias, and alter Egos are, I admit, impervious to arguments, mine or anybody elses.

I think, myself, that Shakespeare's "Henry the Eighth" was not the Play "All Is True," which was on the boards of the Globe Theatre when that edifice was destroyed by fire at the total loss, according to Sir Henry Wotton, "of a bit of straw and a few forsaken cloakes." (But that is a long question which I will not enter upon here). The general explanation of the non-appearance of the Henry the Eighth among the Quartos is, I believe, that the Play was not Shakespeare's, but Fletcher's, or Shakespeare's and Fletcher's, and this is proved by the neo-Shakespeareans, by counting the lines, classifying them as stopped-ending, unstopped-ending,

etc., lines. This mathematics of prosody, I am aware, convinces many clever commentators. I have never taken it very seriously myself.

In all this Dramatic career Shakespeare never but in this single instance wrote a play "with a purpose". I do not mean—without a trend. Doubtless the trend of Othello is to teach the reader to beware of Jealousy, Timon to teach the heartlessness of sycophants, and so on. Though whether Shakespeare felt over and above his dramatic instincts a compulsion to preach platitudes to his fellow men, I have my doubts.

However, there is no possible manner of doubt as to the purpose of the Play of Henry the Eighth. There is a long story as to the part played by the drama of Richard the Second, and its performance, procured by the Essex conspirators, which Elizabeth herself snuffed treason in, saying to Hayward: "Know ye not that I am Richard." That episode is well recorded History. But in that case the Play was not claimed to have been written for any treasonable purpose. It was only its presentation, at that particular time, of which Elizabeth complained. To be sure, there are at least an hundred laboured volumes consorted to prove Shakespeare a Protestant and a Puritan, by means of passages, phrases, or whole sentences, torn from their contexts, throughout the Plays. The very last of these volumes that has reached my notice is one by a Rev. Dr. Carter, which not only "proves" all it sets out to prove, but indentifies the exact English translation of the Bible that Shakespeare used (the so-called "Bishop's Bible"). All these volumes are, of course, disposed of by such a timid suggestion as that, perhaps, even a Shakespeare was a Dramatist! That even a Shakespeare would put into the mouth of a character what that character would be expected to say; certainly not what he would *not* be expected to say! Even the Rev. Dr. Carter would not argue that Shakespeare was a liar, a scoundrel and a murderer, because he made Iago talk like a liar, a scoundrel and a murderer! We have, I am beginning to think, almost enough of this sort of sign-post criticism and about enough Dr. Carters. And again: There is that item which always intrudes itself just about here:

That famous entry in the Stratford Town records that John Shakespeare cometh not to Church for fear of process for debt! I have already stated in these pages that it was an evident subterfuge, since process for debt could not be served upon a Sunday; that according to the law of England (which is our Common Law to-day in the United States, too) Sunday was the ONLY day when a debtor could safely stray beyond the portal of his house, which is his castle, without being served with process for debt! I don't want to be considered too invariable an iconoclast and doubter

of tales merely because they are accepted! But I might not be able to resist temptation to ask, "What debts John Shakespeare owed that kept him away from Church if he had wanted to go?" We have the Stratford Town records. Who has found in them any entries concerning John Shakespeare's debts?

I am afraid that we will have to admit that this famous entry in the Alderman's minutes was made not to excuse John Shakespeare, but to excuse themselves for not enforcing (as Elizabeth's statute made it their duty to do) John Shakespeare's fines for his stout contumacy in refusing to attend the Protestant services at the newly converted Trinity Church.

But how do we know that John Shakespeare fell into dire poverty? Why, it is proved—as so many things passing strange are proved concerning Shakespeare matters—by an effort of pure reason. *Vidilicet*: John Shakespeare must have been very poor or he would not have removed his son, William, from the Stratford Grammar School at so early an age.

Question: But how do we know that John Shakespeare ever placed his son, William, at that Stratford Grammar School at all?

Answer: Why, if he had not placed him there how could he have taken him away?

(But, perhaps this is unfair. We argue mostly about Shakespeare in a circle, to be sure. But really not quite so palpable a circle as that. It is bad enough as it is, without making it worse!)

Let us say, rather, that we prove that young William Shakespeare was a student at the Stratford Grammar School, because his father was an Alderman; and that it is likely, and probable even, that a son of a Stratford alderman should have been sent to the Stratford Grammar School!

Of course, once a scholar there (which is "proved" beyond the possibility of error by the fact that his father was an Alderman, etc.), young Shakespeare would have been removed from said Grammar School on his father becoming poor. (It is not necessary to prove such a self-evident proposition as that. Were it necessary we would start our circle in thiswise:

Stratford Grammar School was erected upon the ruins of the old Guild of the Holy Cross, which went, of course, when Henry the Eighth "conveyed" all church property to his own use, by force of arms. The Earl of Warwick, however, had moved King Edward the Sixth to restore it as a Grammar School, for the poor of Stratford-on-Avon, and he himself (Earl Warwick, aforesaid) had become its Visitor and Patron. There were no fees at all. It was, as had been the Guild School, which the Catholic

Church had maintained—for the poor children of the vicinage, except that, whereas, the Guild had fed as well as taught these poor children, King Edward's foundation only administered the Grammar School function of what was supposed to be purely intellectual pabulum.

And, being for the poor children—! But, alas, here our circle comes to grief! If there were no fees, and the Grammar School was for the children of the poor, why was it neecssary, when John Shakespeare became poor, that little William should have been taken away from its sessions? And echo answereth not! Nor are we informed either, why John Shakespeare, owner in fee of three substantial residences—tenements on Henley Street with their curtillages, should be obliged to avoid payment of his debts by the easy process of merely refraining from going to church on Sundays. Or, what sort of a debt it was that, under English law (at any period of English history, then, or before, or since) could not be collected out the real estate, but must remain uncollectable except by what the late Mr. Macawber was familiar with, as "Civil Process"?

Would it not be passing strange if this whole fuss about John Shakespeare's poverty was a figment, born of the misreading of that single entry made to save the Stratford Alderman from reprimand, or worse, for not proceeding against their old associates and fellow Catholic?

How, in common sense—(if common sense is permitted in studying Shakespeare matters) could an entry on the Town records free John Shakespeare from a debt? Or how, by a perfectly transparent subterfuge, could he evade the law or take advantage of his own wrong? But as an excuse for remissness in proceeding to collect fines for non-attendance, which Elizabeth's statute (I Eliz., cap 2) made it the Town Council's duty to collect, it was a clever minute to make, as showing good faith or an attempt to do their duty, etc., etc.

Let us see whether we cannot finally and once for all settle this matter of John Shakespeare's debts, as well as the question of his Religion.

If John Shakespeare had been in debt, it would have availed him nothing to absent himself from Church on Sundays. His creditors could have procured an writ of Elegit at any time. An "Elegit" was a Writ issued to the sheriff, commanding him to make delivery of a moiety (and afterwards it was stretched to include the whole) of the debtor's lands and personal property (beasts of the plough only excepted) to the creditor. The sheriff, on possessing himself of the property, would issue an inquest to ascertain the value of the debtor's possessions thus seized. The property is then delivered to the Creditor, who retains it until the debt and costs are

paid. The debtor, meanwhile being a "Tenant by Elegit" of his own lands and goods. This process is as old as England, and is not, perhaps, unknown in many of the United States. But, if John Shakespeare was ever a "Tenant by Elegit" somebody, Malone, or Halliwell-Phillipps; or even poor John Jourdan, who preserved so many tales and traditions that served to lead us to facts, would have found some trace of it!

The Rev. Dr. Bowden has grouped in his fine book, "The Religion of Shakespeare," the internal proofs of all these matters as to which it has been my limited province, occasionally, to present some minor items of physical valuation. Perhaps I may note—though not necessarily as a part of my argument—that Warwickshire was, all through those troublous Elizabethan years of the Old Faith, the headquarters for the Catholic Party. And it is notable that, when William Shakespeare applied to the Herald's College for a grant of coat-armour for John Shakespeare, the tricking of the proposed arms made by the Herald followed the Arms of Nicholas Breakspeare, the first English Pope, Hadrian the Fourth.

It is rarely that the internal criticism of Shakespeare, and the circumstantial and external evidences, collate with and support each other. But I suppose in the future, however, they may have been hostile in the past, no criticism, internal or external, will deny that Carlyle was right when he declared that Catholicism gave us Shakespeare!

Much more generally accepted propositions than this one have acquired general currency through even lesser data. What biographer fails to assert, for example, that Shakespeare and his wife were estranged? But where it there the least authority for such a statement of fact. It perhaps grew out of that "second best bed" interlineation in the Will, as basis for concluding that Shakespeare had forgotten that he had a wife, and that on his attention being called to the fact, he interlineated a slurring bequest. But it is equally as possible (and far more within the presumption that a man and wife are not estranged) that Shakespeare made that interlineation from scrupulous anxiety lest his wife should miss anything she was entitled to. She already had her dower and, as we have lately discovered, the dramatic rights and manuscripts of eighteen of the plays.

A good many biographers (especially the Baconian ones) of Shakespeare lash themselves into veritable fury over the alleged fraudulent and spurious character of this Grant of Arms. But it was doubtless quite as authentic as could be expected of such an institution as the British Herald's College, which certainly was not in that day, nor (it is sometimes hinted) even to-day, exactly like Caesar's wife. However, John Shakespeare's pedi-

gree has been traced to Gwennedd, the first King of All Wales, A. D., 605, which it seems would have entitled him to *some* Grant of Arms. And again, the ambition to possess a Coat of Arms is neither discreditable nor ridiculous, certainly not in a land where these Additions are as highly prized as they are and always have been as in England. And again, William Shakespeare was buried in the Chancel of Stratford Church because he was a leading citizen and a lay-Rector of the Church itself, and he has the grandest monument in that Church, to wit his bust, and a splendid inscription in Latin and another in English, which proves that he was of importance enough to have applied for a Grant of Arms. Quite recently a Mrs. Stopes, of London, raised considerable pother, because an alleged picture of this monumental bust did no resemble either in feature, pose, or incidentals, the bust as we see it to-day, or as a photograph reveals it. The explanation is, of course, that the Dugdale picture was careless and clumsy, and as inaccurate as graphic matters were apt to be in books of the period, if they were not, for some cryptic or emblematic purpose, laboriously exact. Any other explanation would assume a recutting of the monument, and the church expense-book or records of workmen in the Chancel, would be found; or tradition or hearsay would have supplied them such an incident. Such a recutting could not have been done at night or without knowledge of the Church authorities, from the bishop down to the verger and the sexton.

Then there have always been biographers and commentators galore, whose zeal to say something new about Shakespeare has led them into stating guesses as facts. Mr. Lee (Sidney), for example, states in his Life of Shakespeare, as an actual fact, that Mr. Francis Collins (Shakespear's cousin and legal adviser) made a first draft of the Will before Shakespeare signed the present manuscript, which was probated as his last Will. This is a good guess! Most lawyers are obliged to submit many drafts of their clients' Wills. And a man who makes a Will at all usually makes a good many more. But to give one's guesses for facts is almost as bad as Collier's plan of first forging the Records, and then describing how he "discovered them!"

The best of us fall into these temptations. Even Dr. W. W. Greg, who has done so much notable work in detecting errors in our Bibliologies of Shakespeare, in Mr. Lee's wonderful statements of fact: and, who has in other ways, made himself a technical authority in these fields, seems, the moment he begins to write Commentary, to give free rein to his imagination. For example, he has this to say about The Merry Wives of Wind-

sor: "The play as it came from Shakespeare's pen, and as presumably acted on the stage, was substantially as we know it, except that the plot by which the Host of the Garter is cozened of his horses occupied a far more prominent place than now in the later portion, and was intimately interwoven with the *dénouement* of the last act. For the purposes of representation a few unimportant excisions were made in the original text. After a while, and for some reason which I do not attempt to explain, it became necessary or desirable to modify and largely to remove this horse-stealing plot. The work was handed over to one of the playwrights connected with the Lord Chamberlain's company with instructions. He made the necessary excisions and worked over the remainder so as to conceal any too obvious traces of the knife. The last act was probably wholly recast, and following his instructions, he supplied two alternative versions thereof, one adapted for representation at court, the other on the common stage, but differing as it chanced more than was absolutely necessary for the end in view. These alterations were clumsily applied to the stage version. The new popular fifth act was substituted for the original, and in other parts where necessary the altered version was introduced. But the actors were lazy and made but a very poor attempt to learn the new dialogue, while wherever possible they contented themselves with mere omissions, ignoring the new material altogether. They possibly felt some resentment at the interference which threw extra work on their shoulders, and introduced bits of gag containing sly allusions to forbidden matter. The play had caused some talk, possibly scandal, and an enterprising but unscrupulous stationer scented an opportunity. The company was not improbably in disgrace and absent from London at the time. One of the hired actors, however, who had filled a not unimportant role in the play remained behind, and proved amenable. He produced, as the result of a week or two's labour with a not very ready pen, a rough reconstruction of the play, in which, naturally enough, his own part of the Host was the only one rendered throughout with tolerable accuracy." . . .

Like Mr. Lee's statement as to Shakespeare's employment of Francis Collins to make a first draft of the Will, nothing would have been more natural: If Shakespeare was like most clients he might have had his lawyer draw up a dozen, for that matter. However, almost anything "goes" in textual Shakespeare hermeneutics or controversy.

I do not agree with many of my colleagues in these studies, who can see nothing good about Lord Bacon, without crying that this ingratitude to Essex covers all he ever did, with infamy! Queen Elizabeth ordered Lord

Bacon to take the part he did in Essex's trial; and if he had not obeyed, his own head would not have been worth an hour's purchase. And it is sheer slander to charge Bacon with that post-mortem libel on Essex known as "Bacon's Declaration of Abuses," etc., for Bacon himself stated that, when he was commanded to write it, the Queen herself revised it until it was practically new matter, even striking out Bacon's "my lord of Essex" and susbtituting "Essex," when speaking of the beheaded nobleman. I am aware that Lord Bacon's memory is unfashionable in England! But, as to the res adjudicata—that he really did take bribes, I (admitting it as res adjudicata) still have my doubts! Nemo repente fuit turpissimus! Why should a gentleman, a great lawyer, a great philosopher, an adviser of statesmen even before he was a statesman himself—who had won golden opinions from all sorts of people—why should such an one all at once, all in an instant sink to the lowest depths of depravity and dishonour? I have pondered the question. Once I believed that Bacon's enemies contrived it. But another explanation has occurred to me. Could it be possible that the real beneficiary of those bribes—hundreds of thousands of pounds of them—was King James himself who for his whole reign was in constant straits for money? If this explanation is the right one; if King James really received all that money, everything else is explained! The king's haste to pardon Bacon to remit the collection of his fine but permit it to remain a debt to the Crown so that Bacon could plead it against all his personal creditors and live and die in peace—the speedy restoration of his dignities; call to the House of Lords and all the rest. We will not indulge in too much discursus. But if your inclination should happen to lead you to connect Bacon in any way with the play of Henry the Eighth, you might notice that the conversation between the two gentlemen at the opening of Scene I of Act second conveys an almost accurate account of the trial of the Earl of Essex while Buckingham's speech on the way to his execution that immediately follows is almost a transcript of Essex's speech from the scaffold. And all good Catholics too should have cause for speaking well of Lord Bacon. In carrying out the policy of non-irritation of the Catholics even if he did not himself initiate it he took a prominent part. He urged the queen to modify the oath of conformity and to disregard all act of the Catholics so long as their consciences did not oblige them to overt act of worriment to the State He modified the oath which included Spain (the most Catholic Country—the specification of which aroused memories of Philip and Mary) so that it merely bound the taker of it to "resist foreign invasion." He urged the queen not to insist upon points theoretical; to let no Catholic have the credit

of suffering or martyrdom—to seek to diminish their numbers by encouraging zealous and persuasive preachers, etc. These were some of Bacon's suggestions. At a somewhat later date in King James's reign a memorandum in Bacon's handwriting shows that he, when Attorney General, began even to frame a bill for the restraint of seditious publications concerning the Papal authority.

I cannot see that it would have been impossible for Shakespeare in "taking humours of men daily," as Aubrey says he did, to have absorbed or appropriated somewhat that came from so prolific a pen as Bacon's was. "That I light my candle at another man's candle does not destroy my property in my own wick and my own wax," said Jonathan Swift! And, as I am laying down my own Shakespeare exegesis, it seems to me that I cannot say more, nor well say less, as to the actual physical sources of the Shakespeare Text!

Men make new books as apothecaries make new mixtures by pouring from one bottle many bottles into one. The very commentary that in one paragraph demands that Shakespeare should be summoned from Hades to account for his genius, in the next paragraph announces that it has traced this, that and the other passage in his Plays to this or that volume, or author, or influence.

One of the things in Shakespearean criticism that most of us look hopelessly for is the time when a little common sense shall suggest that Shakespeare was a human being like the rest of us and that we can account for most of him rationally by admitting it and ceasing to rack out imaginations for explanations of the unexplainable that has only, after all, conjecture behind it.

Believe me, Dear Sir,

Faithfully yours,

Appleton Morgan.

MARGINALIA

THE NUMBER OF THE BEAST IN BACONIANA FOR OCTOBER, 1910, IS A paper by Sir Edward Durning Lawrence, which may fairly be stated as Baconianism run mad. Nothing less than a reprint of the paper, which occupies pages 208-217 of Baconiana, could describe the marvelous discoveries and deductions from these discoveries in which Sir. Edward revels. The utmost space will allow, is a sample conveniently co-herent to be comprehended without its context:

At a very early date Bacon selected the number "53" to give in numerous books revelations concerning his authorship. In Florio's "Second Frutes," published in 1591, on page 53 we read:—

"H.: A slice of bacon would make us taste this wine well.
S.: What ho, set that gammon of bakon upon the board."

Florio was always a servant of Bacon's, and received a pension for "making my lord's works known abroad." The above is inserted on page 53 to inform us that Bacon's name may be spelled in many different ways, as students of various books will find to be the fact.

In the "Mikrokosmos," published at Antwerp, both in Latin and in French, in 1592, we get on page 53 a picture of Circe's Island, which represents "the stage." Beneath it are the words from the Proverbs: "Stolen waters are sweet, and bread eaten in secret is agreeable."

On examining the engraving we perceive in the forefront Bacon's boar, drawn exactly as it is heraldically portrayed in Bacon's crest, but with a man's head surmounted by a "Cap of Liberty," and we should remember the words in Shakespeare's play, *As you Like it* (which means "Wisdom from the mouth of a clown"):—

"I must have liberty: . . .
To blow on whom I please, for so fooles have . . .
Invest me in my motely: Give me leave

To speak my mind, and I will through and through
Cleanse the foule bodie of the infected world
If they will patiently receive my medicine."

In Bacon's "Advancement of Learning," 1640, first edition in English, we find at first page "53." In the margin of this page we find "Alexand"; (Bacon sometimes alluded to himself as Alexander). But the page 55 is misnumbered "53," and on this second and false page "53" we read in the margin

S. FRAN.
BACON,

all in capital letters, almost the only marginal capital letters in the whole of the book, which is Bacon's own book, and yet it has this striking reference to himself on the false page "53." The number of pages "53" (very frequently falsely paged "53"), in which some reference to Bacon or to the plays may be discovered, is very large. I will, however, quote only two or three other instances.

In Rowe's edition of Shakespeare's plays, 1709, which is the fifth edition, there is a proper page 53, and also 55 is misprinted 53 (being the only mispagination in the whole book of 3,324 pages), and this is made in the false page 53 in order to afford us a revelation if we carefully read both pages "53" together.

In 1664 seven extra plays of W. Shakespeare's were added to the previous thirty-six plays, and the editors, in order to mislead the informed and pretend that they had Bacon's authority for so adding some of his inferior plays to his revised selection of the thirty-six plays which formed the Great Folio of 1623, numbered two pages 53, which they placed opposite to each other, and on each of these we find "S. Alban" (Bacon was Viscount S. Alban).

Clearly this is our old friend *The Number of the Beast.*

Several generations ago people hungry for cryptic marvels selected the name *Napoleon* for all storts of prophetic and protentious anagrammatization and contortion. And with considerably more success than Sir Edward Dubning Lawrence. For it must not be overlooked that the Napoleonists usually were able to prove their figures and literations, whereas Sir Edward is not always so fortunate.

At the time that Napoleon threatened an attempt to invade England, English pulpits were often occupied by prophesying that he was the Anti-Christ spoken of in the Apocalypse. Many preachers arrived at their opinion in this way. In Revelations, XIII, 18, the Number of the Beast is given as six hundred three score and six, while in the same chapter, verse 5, the number of months during which the Beast was to be permitted to blaspheme was forty-two.

Now the Hebrew numerals were expressed by the Hebrew alphabet thus: The first nine letters represented the digits, the rest of the alphabet represented tens. Applying this system to the French alphabet, we have:

A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I J	K	L	M	N	O	P	Q	R	S
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	20	30	40	50	60	70	80	90

T	U	V	W	X	Y	Z
100	110	120	130	140	150	160

Using this notation we have, using the apostrophe as an E,

L'Empereur Napoleon=666

and the number of months

Quarante-deux=666

or, taking the Italian form of the name, Napoleon Buonaparte, and arranging it into columns, we have:

N	O	A
A	N	P
P	B	A
O	U	R
L	O	T
E	N	E
—	—	—
6	6	6

But this is not all:

Jeremiah IV:7 reads: "The lion is come up from his thicket, and the destroyer of the Gentiles is on his way; he is gone forth from this place to make thy land desolate. But in Greek, the word "thicket" is "Napos," and "Lion" is Leon, which is again, *Napoleon!*

There is a class of writers known as Lippogrammatists. They would write by dropping letters, thus:

Amore, more, ore, re: One in love, in manners, in words (or speech) and in deed.

Using the name *Napoleon*, as a lippogram, we have:

Napoleon, Apoleon, Poleon, Oleon, Leon, Eon, On,

Which is Greek for "Napoleon, being the lion of the People, was marching on destroying (the) cities."

Then the Anagrammatists began to work. They found in the name Napoleon Bonaparte the anagrams:

Bona rapta, leno pone! Or, in English, "No, appear not at Elba."

Adding "Lucius" to the name, we have the anagram:

Lucius Napoleon Bonaparte Imperator. Subaltero Nerone, arma capiunt populi!

Adding "Louis", we have:

Louis Napoleon Bonaparte—Arouse, Albion! an open Plot!

And there is said to be an ancient numerical prophesy, made by Galaos, a monk of the Abbey of St. Benoir sur Loire, which runs thus:

12 15 22 9 19 14 1 16 15 12 5 15 14 2 21 15 14
1 16 1 18 20 5 18 5 16 18 5 19 5 14 20 1 14 20
4 21 15 1 16 1 18 20 5 18 5 16 18 19 5 14 20 1 14
20 4 21 16 5 21 16 12 5 4 5 4 9 23 4 5 16 1
18 20 5 13 5 14 20 19 19 19 5 18 1 16 18 5 19 9 4 5
14 20 4 5 18 5 16 21 2 12 9 17 21 5 6 18 1 14 3 1 9
19 5 9 14 4 9 22 9 19 9 2 12 5 16 1 18 12 5 19 21 6 6
18 1 7 5 21 14 9 22 5 18 19 5 12 22 5 18 19 12 5 4
9 23 14 5 21 22 9 5 13 5 19 9 5 3 12 5

This prophecy, which is found in a book entitled "Questions d'Avenir," is based upon the rule that each digit has the force of its numeral from 1 to 25. So read, it becomes "Louis Napoleon Buonaparte, répresentant du peuple de dix départements, fera président de République Francaise, indivisible, démocratique, par le suffrage universelle, vers de dix neuvième siecle!!!"

But there is another queer thing about this prophecy.

By adding up all the figures representing letters, thus:

Louis=77			
Napoleon=92	Departements=140	Indivisible=114	vers=64
Buonaparte=113	Fera=43	Democratique=131	
Representant=155			le=17
Du=25	President=110	par=35	
Peuple=75	de=9	le=17	dix=36
De=9	République=126	suffrage=73	neuvieme=94
Dix=36	Francaise=76	universel=128	siecle=53
582	504	498	264

And in 1848 is the year the prophesy came true by the election of Louis Napoleon Bonaparte to the Presidency of the second French Republic!

But even now, wonders have not ceased with the magic name! If you write in heavy script figures the number of votes for and against for President, thus, on a piece of transparent paper, the reverse of that paper will read (or if you hold what you have written before the mirror it will be the same):

In favor, In opposition,
7119736|1113000

it will read in the glass: "III EMPEREUR."

Can the Baconians do as well as these Napoleonophobists.

Let us attempt to equal them though we despair of equalling Sir Edward During Lawrence.

Supposing we construct such a sentence as

William Shakespeare wrote these plays all by himself.

Nobody who will bother to take a lead pencil and the back of an old envelope can see that the numerical value of the letters composing this sentence is exactly 2872! The right hand digit being, of course, negligible, if, as Sir Edward Durning Lawrence says: "the figures are properly manipulated," we can always consider any inconvenient digit as negligible, we have the number 287, which was, we remember, Mr. Ignatius Donnelly's "Root number."

But the number 287 has other properities lurking within it. The sum of its digits is seventeen. And it was in the seventeenth century that Bacon wrote Shakespeare the Shakespeare Plays. The alphabetical equivalents for the digits 2 8 7 are 2 0, are the letters B H G, which, of course, mean *Bacon Heminge Guess.* That is, as everybody knows, *Bacon Heminge Guess,* why Lord Bacon selected Heminge as one of the Editors of the First Folio.

Again multiplying the digits 2x8x7, we have the equivalent alphabet for multiplying the digits 2x8x7 we have the number 112. The alphabetic equivalent of 112 is A A B. And we at once think of little Mote's question in Loves Labour Lost: "What is B A spelled backwards?"

We might proceed further with this wonderful number 287. We might show that the middle digit 8 divided by the first digit 2, gave us f 4, and that taking the last digit 7, and making a number 47, by writing them together -nd, that 47 was Bacon's age at a certain period of his career. (Only we suppose the appetite for contradiction normal in every Shakespearean breast would induce somebody to immediately rise and protest that at a certain period in his lifetime William Shakespeare was 47 years of age.

So we forbear and leave this fascinating field to Sir Edward Durning Lawrence.

WILLIAM F. PARKER.

* * *

WERE THERE BILLS OF THE PLAY IN SHAKESPEARE'S TIME? In 1537 one John Charlewood was granted a license to be sole Printer of all manner of Bills for Players. But whether these bills were bills of the Play or bills, or as we would say now, bill heads of the Players, or merely announcements, as we would say now, Posters, we have no means of knowing. It is probable, however, that they were announcements of the Play, the day and hour, admission prices, etc., etc, possibly the name of the author of the play was also given.

There is preserved among the Harlian Miscellanies a letter written on

the 19th of January in that year. (Chamberlain to Carleton.) "And now we are in mirth, I must not forget to tell you of a consuming prancke of one Venner, of Lincoln's Inne, that gave out bills of a famous play on Saturday was sevenight on the Banckeside, to be acted only by certain gentlemen and gentlewomen of account. The price at comming in was two shillings or eighteen pence at least, and when he had gotten most part of the mony into his hands he wold have shewed them a faire paire of heeles, but he was not so nimble to get up and on horseback, but that he was faine to forsake that course and betake himselfe to the water, where he was pursued and taken . . . In the meantime the common people, when they saw themselves deluded, revenged themselves upon the hangings, curtains chaires, stooles, walles and whatsoever came in their way, very outragiously and made great spoile; there was great store and good companie and many noblemen."

In Brown's City Wit, the Prologue enters, bearing in his hand a Title Boar. This he hangs up, with comments of the moment. A member of the Company of Players visiting a town would perambulate the streets with a drum, announcing the Play, January 8th, 1663. Mr. W. S. Lawrence, who is good authority, tells us the Prologue entered at Davenant's Theatre on the premier of The Adventures of Five Hours, bearing in his hand a bill, and from it read to the audience "This day, the 15th of December, shall be acted a new play, never played before, called The Adventures of Five Hours."

But Bills of the Play, as we now have them, distributed to the audience, to give them the cast and the scenic arrangement, etc., are of very modern conception.

* * *

Our always valued contributor, Mr. Basil Brown, has made a real contribution to cojectural Shakespeare Iconography. In a thoughtful pamphlet ("Supposed Caricature of the Droeshout Portrait of Shakespeare (New York, 1911)" Mr. Brown submits that he has discovered what he believes to be an intentional caricature of Shakespeare's face, as portrayed by Martin Droeshout in the frontispiece of the First Folio. In the woodcuts illustrating a metrical tract "Heads of all Fashions" (1642) by John Taylor who loved to be called The Water Poet, is one which strikes Mr. Brown as too close a resemblance to the Droeshout to have been accidental. The Water Poet, John Taylor, produced during the first half of the seventeenth

century much more or less humorous literature. In 1612 he was burlesquing Coryat's "Crudities" of travel. In 1651 he published a batch of ninety epigrams. He had been Shakespeare's contemporary. Mr. Brown assumes and believes that the Water Poet knew Shakespeare personally, and when the First Folio came out was so disgusted with the Droeshout picture that he made, or caused to be made by his nephew, a caricature of it, and used the caricature afterward in his "Heads of All Fashions." As to the actual author of the drawing:

"Two portraits of John Taylor, the Water Poet, are in the Oxford picture gallery. They are signed *'John Taylor pinx,* 1665.' This was the poet's nephew, who, we think, presented them to the gallery two years after the death of the Water Poet. This nephew may have been a son of Joseph Taylor, the actor, and have had a kindred liking for art, and may have drawn the caricature of the Droeshout head which so interested me many years ago that I had a facsimile made for my own amusement, and I now offer it as a curiosity well worth the interest of other Shakespearians."

To illustrate his theory that this Taylor caricature (otherwise des bottes) is intended as a slur upon Droeshout's wooden and banal production. Mr. Brown has placed the caricature upon the Droeshout shoulders, as shown in our frontispiece. Commenting upon Mr. Brown's cleverness, the New York Sun says editorially: We leave it to our readers to compare the tall head from the Taylor tract with the Droeshout print and to draw their conclusions. But it interests us to discover an ardent Shakespearian who is neither trying to prove that William Shakespeare was Francis Bacon's chiropodist nor evolving painfully from a cryptogram in the "Merry Wives of Windsor" the algebraic substance of Laplace's "Mécanique Céleste."

And Mr. William Stone Booth (happily abandoning his kindergarten "Acrostics") has also entered the constructive Iconographic field ("The Droeshout Portrait of William Shakespeare An experiment in Identification, with thirty-one illustrations by William Stone Booth, Boston, W. A. Butterfield). Mr. Booth has proceeded in the line of composite photography, to submit the Droeshout alleged likeness alleged to superimposition respectively of the face, beard, hair, eyes, nose, chin, etc., of the three relative portraits of Bacon (the Worthington, Marshall and Passe, portraits). In thus overlaying the Droeshout, Mr. Booth claims to demonstrate his "suspicion that the two personalities (Shakespeare and Bacon) are either identical or at least that they bear an anatomical resemblance to each other. "Whatever opinion one may have on the matter he should not neglect these unique and minute graphic studies of Mr. Brown and Mr. Booth. Mean-

while Dr. Orville W. Owen has discovered yet one more cipher of Bacon's This last one is in Sidney's Arcadia (written by Bacon). This directs him (Owen) to Coffer-dam the river Wye and find by excavation in its bed the real papers in the case of the Bacon-authorship of Shakespeare. Were Dr. Owen an Englishman he might have been placed in a Bedlam! Being a monied American the Duke of Bedford has licensed him to dam and dig to his heart's content.

* * *

***The Editors cannot undertake to return unused manuscript, though they will endeavor to do so if self-directed, stamped envelope is enclosed therewith.

All manuscripts submitted *must be type-written.*

Address all matters intended for The Editors, Books for Reviews, etc., NEW SHAKESPEAREANA, care of The Unionist-Gazette Association, SOMERVILLE, NEW JERSEY.

Detail from the Henry W. Savage production of "Everywoman," Mr. Browne's Modern Moralit Play, at the Lyric Theatre, New York City. Miss Hall as "Everywoman," Mr. Daly as "Flattery.

[See Marginalia, and Bookmatter, No. 369. within.]